



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.         | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/537,587  | 06/06/2005  | Takashi Watanabe     | 46884-5365 (210821)         | 6382                   |
| 55694   | 7590        | 02/09/2009           |                             |                        |
| DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH (DC)<br>1500 K STREET, N.W.<br>SUITE 1100<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20005-1209 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>GREEN, TRACIE Y |                        |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2879            | PAPER NUMBER           |
|   |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>02/09/2009     | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/537,587

**Examiner**

TRACIE Y. GREEN

**Applicant(s)**

WATANABE ET AL.

**Art Unit**

2879

**—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —**

THE REPLY FILED 16 January 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-34

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

/Sikha Roy/  
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2879

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1. Applicant's arguments filed 01/16/2009 has been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant first asserts that the secondary reference of Tsutomu is non-analogous art and one of ordinary skill would have no reason to look at this reference to modify the primary reference as presented by the examiner. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant on Page 3, paragraph 7, the applicant discloses that the alkali generating agent is used for secondary emission. In the Tsutomu reference, the material containing alkali is used as an electron emission material. Even though, they are used in different devices one active and the other being passive, one of ordinary skill in the art could use the teachings of Tsutomu to come up with the compound disclosed by the applicant. The applicant's photocathode and the flash discharge both resolve the same issue dealing with their devices, the one of electron emission.

Applicant further submitted graphs and charts to demonstrate an improved device. Examiner appreciates the disclosure however, the reference as cited and claimed is still rendered obvious by the combination of devices despite their usage both deal with electron emission. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, as asserted above photocathodes, photomultipliers depend upon electron emission to function properly and so do discharge tubes. Applicant seems to focus on Tsutomu as a primary reference when it is secondary to Yorikatsu. As the applicant asserted the negative pole (cathode) of Tsutomu was formed out of this material, but the applicant failed to point out as in Paragraphs 7-10 of the Tsutomu reference that this material is formed such that a more stable electron emitter is formed. Regardless of oxidation-reduction or applying voltage to generate electron emission, the reference still teaches on the composition of the material alkali material as a electron emitter.

Examiner believes that *prima facie* case of obviousness has been demonstrated and that all rejections are proper..